

Civilian Research Project Senior Service College Fellow

The Drawdown in Europe: What Does it Mean?

by

Colonel R. Taft Blackburn
United States Army



United States Army War College
Class of 2012

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT: A

Approved for Public Release
Distribution is Unlimited

This manuscript is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Senior Service College Fellowship. The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 30-04- 2012		2. REPORT TYPE Civilian Research Paper		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Drawdown in Europe: What Does it Mean?				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) COL R. Taft Blackburn				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Atlantic Council of the United States 1101 15 th Str NW Washington DC, 20005				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College, 122 Forbes Ave., Carlisle, PA, 17013-5220				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT DISTRIBUTION A: Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT In an age of austerity requiring hard fiscal decisions, the current geopolitical framework supports the new U.S. defense focus on Asia and the Middle East while rebalancing forces in a safer more secure Europe. The rebalance of forces in Europe still provides a strong commitment to NATO through reversibility, a better response to current security needs emanating from European challenges and threats, and committing a Brigade Combat Team to the NATO Response Force. While this promotes partnership building and interoperability, it focuses almost solely at the tactical level of brigade and below. In order to improve partnership building and interoperability, the United States should conduct command post exercises with our European Allies at the division and corps level, allow Allies to provide units and staff to our regional aligned brigades, increase personnel exchange programs, offer key developmental billets from brigadier general to major in European based U.S. commands and units, and collaborate with our European Allies on security cooperation activities.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Defense Strategy, Force Posture in Europe, NATO, Article V, Partnership Building					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			Dr. C. Richard Nelson
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified	UNLIMITED	36	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code) 202-778-4968

USAWC CIVILIAN RESEARCH PROJECT

THE DRAWDOWN IN EUROPE: WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

by

Colonel R. Taft Blackburn
United States Army

Dr. C. Richard Nelson
Faculty Adviser
Atlantic Council of the United States

This CRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Senior Service College fellowship.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: COL R. Taft Blackburn

TITLE: The Drawdown in Europe: What Does it Mean?

FORMAT: Civilian Research Project

DATE: 30 April 2012 WORD COUNT: 9,856 PAGES: 36

KEY TERMS: Defense Strategy, Force Posture in Europe, NATO, Article V, Partnership Building

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

In an age of austerity requiring hard fiscal decisions, the current geopolitical framework supports the new U.S. defense focus on Asia and the Middle East while rebalancing forces in a safer more secure Europe. The rebalance of forces in Europe still provides a strong commitment to NATO through reversibility, a better response to current security needs emanating from European challenges and threats, and committing a Brigade Combat Team to the NATO Response Force. While this promotes partnership building and interoperability, it focuses almost solely at the tactical level of brigade and below. In order to improve partnership building and interoperability, the United States should conduct command post exercises with our European Allies at the division and corps level, allow Allies to provide units and staff to our regional aligned brigades, increase personnel exchange programs, offer key developmental billets from brigadier general to major in European based U.S. commands and units, and collaborate with our European Allies on security cooperation activities.

THE DRAWDOWN IN EUROPE: WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

The stationing of U.S. forces has been a legacy in Europe for over 65 years. Initially, U.S. forces remained in Europe at the end of the World War II in order to occupy areas of the former Axis Powers. In short order, they became a central component of the Cold War strategy of Containment. At the peak of the Cold War, there were over 375,000 uniformed members of the Armed Forces in Europe.¹ However, since the end of the Cold War, the United States has gone through two major draw downs in Europe. The first, starting in 1992, brought U.S. forces down to 100,000 service members. The second, starting in 2004, brought the number down to 79,000. Now the Obama Administration is proposing a third drawdown that will remove half of the U.S. combat brigades in Europe and bring down troop strength to 68,000 in Europe.

The driving factor of this third draw down is an unprecedented economic challenge to America.² The U.S. economy, which is a central element of its security – paying for its forces and providing resources to underpin its tools of engagement and power throughout the world, is facing a fiscal crisis, which is threatening the economic wellbeing of the country.³ According to government projections, should spending continue at the current rate, the debt to GDP ratio will reach 100% as early as 2022 and continue upwards to an unsustainable rate of 200% around 2035.⁴ Political leaders of both parties recognized the importance that the military play a role in battling the annual budget debt. This political consensus resulted in legislation requiring a cut to military spending of 487 billion dollars over the next ten years, which also has been supported by the current and past Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.⁵

For most of the last quarter of 2011, the Department of Defense worked on a new strategy that it believes will meet the United States' needs while still realizing this significant savings from the military budget.⁶ On January 5, 2012, the Department of Defense rolled out a new defense strategy entitled, "Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for a 21st Century Defense," which he referred to as guidance and in this paper will be called the 'Defense Guidance' and on February 3, 2012, it released "The Defense Budget Priorities and Choices," which will be referred to as the Budget Priorities in this paper. These documents provide a set of global priorities for the U.S. Armed Forces, which provide the framework for DoD's defense strategy in the world, and they call for a pivot to Asia, greater emphasis in the Middle East, and a drawdown in Europe. A few days later, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta provided outline of this drawdown, which includes the removal of two heavy Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs) and two Air Force Squadrons.⁷

Many bemoan this action fearing a pivot to Asia that neglects Europe is a strategic error, which endangers NATO Article V commitments, and they have good reasons to fear such an impact.⁸ NATO is important to the United States and Article V is its *raison d'être*. NATO provides the United States with an important Transatlantic link to a group of countries that have supported U.S. operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. It promotes security and stability in Europe, a region twice suffering world wars in the 20th Century that drew in the United States and resulted in its largest loss of life in foreign conflicts. It provides a security architecture that promotes European integration, which further decreases the potential of regional armed conflict in Europe. Finally, it provides a ready and interoperable force for future coalitions, and in today's world, the United States is

much more likely to operate as part of a coalition than by its self. The Obama Administration has posited a necessity for this drawdown decision citing the needs to balance new priorities in an age of austerity. If NATO is so important to the United States, can we afford to pivot to Asia and a drawdown of forces in Europe? How will this affect our Article V commitments and the interoperability of forces in Europe?

This paper will examine these questions and argues that in an age of austerity with a requirement to make hard decisions based on limited resources, the current geopolitical framework supports the new priorities, of which a need to ‘rebalance’ forces (i.e., a drawdown) in Europe. This paper will show that while the Administration is conducting a pivot to Asia, this pivot should not be seen as a 180 degree turn away from Europe. On the contrary, the administration is maintaining a strong commitment to Europe and NATO. The first section of this paper will outline the global priorities and the specifics of the drawdown of forces in Europe. Section two will conduct a geopolitical analysis of power in the world to see if the new Defense Guidance’s global priorities – “to rebalance toward the Asia-Pacific and Middle East regions,” while adjusting “the posture to the land forces in Europe” – are an appropriate framework for the U.S. military.⁹ The final section will analyze the objectives of maintaining a commitment to NATO’s Article V and promoting interoperability in Europe as the U.S. draws down forces, both of which are the central goals of a rebalance in Europe. It will also provide some policy suggestions to further our ability to meet these objectives.

Section One: An Outline of the Drawdown in Europe

With the release of the new Defense Guidance and the Defense Budget Priorities, a number of major changes were announced concerning DoD global priorities and U.S.

force structure in Europe. Secretary Panetta bluntly writes in his introductory letter, “[t]he Joint Force will have global presence emphasizing the Asia-Pacific and the Middle East...”¹⁰ While often characterized as a ‘pivot’ to Asia, the impacts of this new focus will be the most striking for Europe. As a result of the Obama Administration’s 2013 budget request, the United States Army Europe (USAREUR) will deactivate two heavy Brigade Combat Teams, the 170th in 2013 and the 172nd in 2014. Fifth Corps Headquarters will also leave Europe when it completes its deployment to Afghanistan in 2012. There will also be a drawdown of approximately 2500 additional military billets from various enabling units throughout USAREUR. The United States Air Force in Europe will inactivate two squadrons in 2013, a German based A-10 squadron and the Italian based 603rd Air Control Squadron.

But, with the continued support to Ballistic Missile Defense in Europe, there will be some increases to elements in Europe to include two Aegis destroyers to be stationed in Spain, radar systems in Turkey, and SM-3 missile sites in Romania and Poland. The U.S. is committing a U.S. based BCT to the NATO Response Force (NRF) and to deploy a battalion to Europe to conduct multi-national training.¹¹ There also will be some, as of yet unspecified, increases to our European based special forces. These changes will entail a reduction of 10,000 service members from Europe leaving 68,000 service members when completed. In total numbers, this is actually a small decrease when compared to the drawdown of land forces after the Cold War.¹² When viewed as a percentage of remaining Land Forces combat power, it is substantial – almost a 50% reduction. The objectives of the drawdown are to “rebalance our investments in Europe” through changes to our force posture while still being able to “maintain our Article 5

commitments to allied security” and to “promote enhanced capacity and interoperability for coalition operations.”¹³

Section Two – The Geopolitical Framework

In order to determine whether the drawdown in Europe is appropriate, an analysis of the underlying strategic framework needs to be done to determine if the administration’s global priorities are correct. Thus, we need to look at Asia, the Middle East and Europe in geopolitical terms. The pivot to Asia should not come as a surprise. It reflects the real and substantial changes to centers of power in the world and new global security dynamics of the 21st Century. The DoD characterized China’s rise to likely “stand out as a defining feature of the strategic landscape of the early 21st century.”¹⁴ The DoD is far from alone in its stand. Fareed Zakaria notes this in his book, *The Post American World*, when he argues that America needs to make fundamental changes to handle the “the rise of the rest” and then focuses on what he views as the next major powers to join the United States as true global powers: India, “the Ally,” and China, “the Competitor.”¹⁵ Two separate analyses of hard power conducted for the National Intelligence Council by the Pardee Center of the University of Denver utilizing its International Futures model (Ifs) shows a geopolitical power shift from the West to China and India occurring over the next two decades.¹⁶

The main reason for this pivot is China, which has gone from one of the poorest countries in the world just forty years ago to overtake Japan economic stature as having the world’s second largest GDP. For the last ten years, China has averaged a 10 percent growth rate.¹⁷ While it will take decades of sustained double digit growth for it to

overtake the United States and become the leading world economic power, it is already able to challenge its neighbors and the United States in the East Asian-Pacific region.¹⁸

China is also a growing military power. The current Deputy Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter, while a professor at Harvard in 2007, wrote:

[C]hina is building a military capability to match its global ambitions and prevail in its regional rivalries. In China's eyes, it does not yet possess a military strong enough to fulfill the important role it envisions for the future. Moreover, China weighs its military power in relation to the neighbors it seeks and to deter and overbear – India, Japan, and Russia, as well as the United States.¹⁹

China is fulfilling this statement and has taken aggressive steps in Asia, especially the South China Sea.²⁰ Over the past decade, the annual increase in Chinese military expenditures averaged 12.1 percent, which is almost two percentage points higher than China's GDP growth rate for the same period. Its military budget for 2011 was estimated at 160 Billion US dollars making it the second largest in the world.²¹ At the same time, the United States and China have close economic relationship with China ranked as our number one trade partner in total trade volume.²² These facts point to the development of a complex, symbiotic relationship that will involve competition and cooperation between the United States as a status quo power and China as a challenger.

However, the U.S. pivot to Asia is not solely about China and India. Robert Kaplan in his most recent book, *Monsoon*, argues that the countries surrounding the Indian Ocean “may comprise a map as iconic to the new century as Europe was to the last one.”²³ Asia is becoming the economic center of the world. Seven of the 20 largest economies reside in Asia all with high and expected continuing growth rates.²⁴ And Asia is dangerous. We are currently fighting a war in Afghanistan. Al Qaeda and its affiliates are active throughout South and East Asia. Military forces remain in a 60-year military

truce on the border between North and South Korea. South Asia and the Korean peninsula remain the most likely places for the use of nuclear weapons. Further, Asian defense spending will outpace European defense spending for the first time in modern history in 2012.²⁵ America not only must play a central role in this region due to the high economic and geopolitical stakes, but it needs to do so now to influence China's rise instead of reacting to Asian security dilemmas after they occur.²⁶

Threats and dangers also emanate from the Middle East with the new Defense Guidance recognizing this and placing "*a premium on U.S. and allied military presence in – and support of – partner nations in and around this region.*"²⁷ Not only are we still facing Al Qaeda and its affiliates in this region, but we face an intractable Arab-Israeli conflict, a potential nuclear Iran, and the Arab Spring. If the previous great world upheaval, the fall of the Iron Curtain and break-up of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, have any lessons for what is occurring in the Middle East, it is that this will be a long, difficult transition meaning the Arab Spring is likely to turn into the Arab Decade. Furthermore, the United States is still heavily involved in the stabilization of Iraq even though it has removed its combat forces from this country. Any one of these pose threats to important U.S. interests, but the combination of all of them occurring now in this region, arguably makes it the most insecure area of the world in the short- to mid-term. There should be no doubt that the United States needs to maintain a firm focus on this area given the importance this region plays in the world economy because of its vast production of oil and gas.

At the same time, Europe has become more secure and stable. How does this manifest itself? First, the entire geopolitical landscape has greatly changed since the fall

of the Iron Curtain in 1989. The main reason for a robust military presence in Europe was the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union. They represented not only a threat to Europe, but a true existential threat to the entire Western world. It is interesting to remember how powerful this threat actually was. In 1986, the CIA estimated that the Warsaw Pact had 5.7 million men under arms, 13,000 tactical aircraft, 65,000 tanks, and 41,000 artillery pieces.²⁸ Europe was an armed camp with an almost equal amount of NATO forces poised to respond on a hairpin trigger. War was expected with little or no notice, and both side represented a true existential and ideological threat to one another.

Since the disintegration of the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union in 1991, a number of major changes have occurred in Europe that have strengthened European security and made the European landmass much more stable. By 2012, six of the seven successor states that composed the Warsaw Pact, now all democratic and free market countries, joined NATO.²⁹ Only Russia as the successor state of the Soviet Union (and 11 of the 15 other Soviet Republics) has not become a NATO member. The number of countries belonging to NATO went from 16 to 28 between 1991 and 2009.³⁰ NATO members now form a line across the entire former Western border of the Soviet Union. This has provided a great deal of additional strategic depth, and political strength for NATO. Also, it has provided a number of new, strong coalition members in Iraq and Afghanistan from these former Warsaw Pact countries. What is more, there is no ideological counterpart to NATO threatening to invade Europe at a moment's notice. In fact, there is not even an alliance in the entire world that can compare to NATO size, power, and stature. The Warsaw Pact is gone and the former Soviet states have only a shell of a defensive agreement made of economic and militarily weak states surrounding

Russia in the form of the Collective Security Treaty Organization. Neither Asia nor the Middle East has a comparable multi-national collective defense alliance.

Additionally, Europe underwent an amazing period of democratization and economic transformation. Only two countries are ruled by dictatorships, Belarus and Azerbaijan, although Russia and Ukraine have strong authoritarian rulers. All of the rest of the countries of Europe are now democratic and using capitalist market economies. This is evident again by the large increase of former Warsaw Pact and communist nations that have joined the EU and NATO, which both require high levels of democratization and free markets to be members.³¹

Interstate violence has not occurred within the borders of Western or Central Europe since the end of World War Two. Only the Balkans and Caucasus have seen conflict recently, and this has mainly been limited to intrastate as opposed to interstate violence with one brief and two notable exceptions: the ten day 1991 Slovenian war against Yugoslavia, the 1999 NATO air campaign against Serbia and the 2008 Russian invasion of Georgia. The European sense of security stems from European efforts to develop integrating institutions like the EU and NATO. These institutions foster democracy, civilian control over the military, and human development throughout the region, which works to mitigate sources of conflict between states. Finally, the Europeans feel more secure. The best examples are declining European defense budgets with NATO nations as prime examples. From 1990 to 1994, the average amount spent on defense by European NATO Allies was 2.5% of GDP. By 2010, it had dropped to just 1.7 %.³²

Given this analysis of the strategic framework, a pivot to Asia, while maintaining a focus on the Middle East, is a natural response to the current geopolitical conditions developing in the world. While China is not yet a global superpower able to compete against the United States at every turn, changes in economic, political, and military power in Asia with a concomitant increase in security and decrease in requirements of large standing military forces in Europe support this approach toward Asia, the Middle East, and Europe.

However, due to the importance of NATO to the United States for the reasons outlined in the introduction of this paper, this pivot cannot be a 180 degree pivot that forebodes a decrease in the transatlantic ties that have developed over the last 60 years. Care must be taken to ensure that U.S. commitments to NATO are maintained. In fact, this care to that commitment has been the centerpiece of U.S. policy since the inception of NATO, and the Obama Administration in its National Security Strategy and in the Defense Guidance has maintained this stance. However, does the new drawdown in Europe support this U.S. goal?

Section Three – Analysis of new Drawdown in Europe

Our first step in analyzing the policy decision from the new Defense Guidance concerning Europe is to determine if the goals are attainable. The goals of the policy in Europe are two pronged. First, it is to “rebalance our investments in Europe” through changes to our force posture, and second, complete this rebalance while still being able:

- to “maintain our Article 5 commitments to allied security”;
- to “promote enhanced capacity and interoperability for coalition operations.”³³

The ‘Rebalance’

By the very nature of the cuts in forces stationed in Europe, it is apparent that the “rebalance of our investments” are being achieved. This force is being cut by 14% in manpower terms and is losing 50% of its land combat power. However, there will only be a limited cut in air forces amounting to just one A-10 Squadron and a small supporting squadron in Italy. While the cuts in question involve both land and air forces, due to the minor cuts to the forces in USAFE and the minimal controversy that these cuts have raised, the rest of the analysis will primarily address the cuts to the land forces from USAREUR.³⁴ The real question is what does the United States save with this rebalance.

The costs savings of removing 10K personnel from Europe is substantial. Using numbers from the 2004 CBO report and extrapolating them for this drawdown, the annual savings in 2012 constant dollars would be 218 million US dollars.³⁵ Virtually all of this money would be realized in savings due to the fact that the units in question would be inactivated and the Army will be reducing its personnel end strength by an even larger amount in the next five years. This means that many of the upfront costs associated with a return of forces to the continental United States, primarily military construction costs, would not be required for this drawdown.³⁶

Of course, there are some additional costs to deploy elements to Europe. The same CBO report estimated that the costs to rotate a brigade from CONUS to Europe and back were 32 million USD. This did not include shipping most equipment under the assumption that brigade sets of equipment would be maintained in Europe. Assuming that only a battalion task force (and that the cost would be approximately 1/4 the cost of deploying a brigade), will deploy twice a year, the costs would be approximately 16

million dollars based on the CBO report. The net result is a savings of approximately 202 million dollars per year.³⁷ The price would increase if the Army decides not to maintain a set battalion set of equipment in Europe.³⁸ Over a ten year period, this equates to approximately 2 billion dollars.

While this is a significant savings for the Army, the real cost savings comes from the actual elimination of these positions from the government rolls. Based on an extrapolation of the CBO 2009 Budget Analysis, the elimination of these 10,000 positions will save DoD approximately 13.5 Billion dollars over a ten year period.³⁹ Total savings from the removal of forces from Europe and the decrease in end strength would be over 15 Billion dollars and this does not include the savings incurred from no longer having to pay for annual operations and maintenance expenses of two BCTs and two Air Squadrons.

Article V Commitment

All NATO nations agree that the Article V commitment is one of the most central elements to NATO collective security. But what does this language actually mean? The premise of Article V is “an attack on one ... shall be considered an attack against all” with individual NATO members responding “by taking...such actions as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.”⁴⁰ Article V should not be viewed as solely a “mercantile” input-output response for NATO forces.⁴¹ In fact, Article V does not place a requirement for forces to be stationed in Europe. After all, if this was solely about a calculated determination of the correct number of NATO brigades to keep on European soil, then the European Allies could certainly increase their forces to create two new combat brigades, especially

after the long decline of European defense spending. I doubt this will occur, however, because Europe does not actually need direct military hard power. It needs U.S. commitment, a political commitment in reality from the last remaining superpower, to support security and stability in Europe.

Of course, U.S. forces stationed in Europe are a visible manifestation of a U.S. commitment, but this commitment to European security should mean a commitment to assisting with real external threats and challenges facing our European Allies not a legacy Cold War based mercantile calculation of military units. Therefore, NATO should not measure a U.S. commitment by the size of forces in Europe, but by the composition and capability of these forces to respond to the real security challenges that NATO Allies face. If this is the case, how does the drawdown as planned meet this commitment? It does this by real, tangible commitments of forces to NATO but that are not all necessarily based on European soil. It does this by providing a better mix of capability to respond to real European threats. Finally, it does so through the concept of 'reversibility.'

Have we committed enough forces?

The Article V commitment requires mission ready forces for the response force. If the previous requirement of the combat power of four U.S. brigades stationed in Europe is the requirement to meet European perception of U.S. commitment to Article V does the new policy meet the same level of mission ready forces for an Article V commitment? With our current force manning readiness policies for BCTs, this is the case. Under the current Army Force Generation (ARFORGEN) model, an Army BCT is only mission-ready for one year of a three year cycle or 1/3 of the time. The other two years are spent

recovering from its mission and preparing for the next mission it will be assigned.

Multiplying 1/3 mission ready time by the four stationed brigades in Europe means that the U.S. will average 1.33 BCTs in a mission ready state over the course of a three year period.

Under the new proposal, we will have 2 European stationed BCTs, which, when multiplied by 1/3 mission ready time, results in 0.667 in a mission ready state average. Adding the NRF committed BCT that is stationed in the U.S. means that the United States increases the number of mission ready BCTs for NATO to an average of 1.667 over a three year ARFORGEN cycle.⁴²

We should also look at the reality of mission ready brigades in Europe over the last six years. In this period, we have seldom had combat ready brigades in Europe at all. The truth of the matter is that we have had on average about two brigades in Europe but they were not in a mission ready state. Instead, they were preparing to deploy to either Iraq or Afghanistan. The other two brigades, which were in a mission ready state, were actually conducting real world combat missions in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The United States is not only providing land forces support to NATO. It has also maintained its earlier commitment to provide a ballistic missile defense system that will forward station two Aegis destroyers in Spain, deploy a radar system in Turkey, and station SM-3 missile systems in Romania and Poland. These systems respond to a specific missile threat from Iran, provide an important new U.S. capability and force structure in Europe, and should part of any calculus when determining whether we have the right amount of forces in Europe.

Finally, in the Age of Austerity that is facing all of the NATO Allies, almost every country is decreasing its military force structure. Given the extreme budget pressures on the United States and its important role as an arsenal of democracy, protecting our economy and controlling fiscal expenditures, like our other Allies are doing, should not come as a surprise. In fact, our NATO Allies should be careful about holding the United States to a standard too much higher than their own. This will increase resentment in key elements of the U.S. Government, like Congress, where many people already believe that our European Allies are not pulling their own weight in this alliance. It is important to note that only 25% of BCTs being inactivated by the United States will come out of Europe. The rest will be inactivated in the United States. On the other hand, almost all of the forces being cut by our European Allies have come from European based forces. In addition, even after the removal of our forces from Europe, we will continue to maintain a larger forward stationed presence here than anywhere else in the world to include Asia toward where we are making a pivot.

Are we providing the right capabilities?

To determine whether we are providing the right capabilities, it is important to look at the real threats and security challenges facing Europe and then see if the capabilities provided meet these challenges. There are two broad categories of threats that face Europe – traditional and nontraditional threats.⁴³ Also, the concepts of threats and the ways and means to deal with them are “converging.”⁴⁴ On both sides of the Atlantic Ocean, the NATO nations are face similar challenges and the United States views the challenges facing Europe through a similar lens as the Europeans. While there is an array of traditional threats facing Europe today, the United States, the European Union,

NATO and most of the countries in Europe believe that Europe is more stable, peaceful, and secure than ever before and that the threat of state on state military conflict is extremely low.

However, they also note that traditional threats do exist and include instability on borders and on the periphery of NATO and EU countries especially in the Balkans, Caucasus, and Turkey's borders; the potential of armed conflict outside of the borders of Europe to include the Korean peninsula and Afghanistan; and Iranian missile development.

Nontraditional threats include transnational and domestic terrorism, organized criminal groups, threats to energy security, disruptions and attacks in cyberspace; weakening or disruption of European integration and the transatlantic alliance, instability as a result of government transformation (e.g., the Arab Spring), and failed states and bad governance that creates political and security vacuums.

It is significant that none of these states, NATO, or the EU identify a direct military threat in Europe and that in the case of most of the nontraditional threats and some of the traditional threats, the most important means to counter them lie not with military power but through political, diplomatic, or legal mechanisms or a combination of all three with military power in support of them. The best proof of European security is their own significant drawdown of forces and capability in Europe.

Given the types of threats facing Europe, the United States is actually being more responsive to European needs with this drawdown. While we are removing traditional combat power meant to deal with a traditional military threat, we are actually providing new capabilities that are more in line with what the EU, NATO, most if not all European

nations, and the U.S. believe is in fact the new primary threats to NATO. These capabilities are Ballistic Missile Defense and Special Forces. BMD will of course protect against small array of missiles from outside of the region and is targeted at Iran. Special Forces provide a real and credible deterrent to terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. They also provide an enhanced capability to work closer with our NATO Allies in this important military field, which will not only make our allies more effective to counter these real challenges to Europe but will also increase U.S. and European interoperability in this field.

In addition to these capabilities that will be increasing, the United States is supporting Smart Defense, an effort to pool and share capabilities, and supported the new NATO Concept, which identifies three core tasks – collective defense, crisis management, and cooperative security.⁴⁵ Both of these efforts focus on meeting these new security challenges facing Europe. When coupled with the commitment of a U.S. BCT to the NRF, this adds real teeth to a U.S. commitment to the security challenges facing Europe. Given the fiscal challenges that the United States is facing, keeping our commitment to these programs and increases these capabilities in future should be taken as a strong commitment to Europe and NATO.

While the author would argue that the U.S. is meeting its commitment to maintain Article V, the final real determination lies not in a qualitative analysis but instead in the subjective perceptions held by European NATO members. This means explaining the drawdown and explaining how the U.S. will still respond to threats facing Europe is extremely important. The U.S. also needs to ensure it maintains commitments that it agrees to.

However, we should also require this of our partners. Consultations on force modifications in the future should be multilateral and a mechanism should be put in place to make this occur. This will not only help all Allies feel more secure, but it would also help with the concept of ‘Smart Defense.’

Is ‘Reversibility’ really built into the system?

‘Reversibility’ is an important concept from the Defense Guidance.⁴⁶ Concerning NATO, it means that if the security environment changes, the United States will build into its force the capability to reverse actions that it has undertaken. The United States is keeping both of the German bases open from which the 170th BCT and 172nd BCT are currently based. It also has built barracks space for a BCT at Task Force East in Bulgaria and Romania. Even if there is a consolidation and much of the barracks space is taken at Baumholder, there will be plenty of barracks space to support a rotational deployment of two BCTs to Grafenwoer and Task Force East. Given the threats facing Europe, locating a BCT in Romania and Bulgaria would actually be an even greater deterrent or show of force to those threats emanating from the Middle East and on the borders of Turkey.

Additionally, while USAREUR will lose two BCTs and a Corps Headquarters from Europe, it is not losing any other units. The important enablers to support our forces in Europe will remain. This includes infrastructure at sea and airports. After all, the combat support and logistics tail is larger than the actual combat force and maintaining the infrastructure in ports will allow for U.S. forces to rapidly deploy and be resupplied without the necessity to build up this logistical capability prior to a deployment.

Enhanced Capacity and Interoperability for Coalition Operations

The Obama Administration has also stressed its desire to promote capacity and interoperability for coalition operations with our European Allies. The first major impact, while not some tangible or measureable item, is a conceptual and cultural mindshift at DoD and even more important in the U.S. Armed Forces. Ten years of coalition warfare in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya not to mention an even broader timeframe conducting joint peacekeeping operations in the Balkans, has changed DoD's perspectives of the importance of shaping operations and has placed a much greater focus on building partner capacity.

The results are a series of new joint and army doctrinal publications that bear this out. Some examples of this are JP 3.0 and 5.0, which both discuss the importance of planning for shaping operations, and the JP 3-22, which is a joint manual devoted to foreign internal defense and security force assistance. The Army's new operations doctrinal manual, ADP 3-0 Unified Land Operations, devotes a entire paragraph to the importance of building partner capacity.

These cultural changes have also resulted in tangible changes in the way the military functions. The Army stood up the 162nd Infantry Training Brigade to train units deploying worldwide how to be more effective in security assistance and building partner capacity.⁴⁷ It is also developing aligned brigades to deploy to various COCOMs in order to assist building partner capacity with the first brigade in training now to deploy to AFRICOM area of operations.⁴⁸

The language in the Defense Guidance also attests to the importance placed on the partnerships and building partner capacity. Throughout the document, working with partners and building partner capacity is stressed in each region. Strategist Frank

Hoffman calls the Defense Guidance the “pivot and partner strategy” and notes that words like partner and allies can be found in it over 53 times.⁴⁹ Of course, the DoD’s drawdown in Europe did not create this mindset change nor is it the reason for the change in emphasis on engagement with our allies, but it does show that the language in the Defense Guidance is not just rhetoric but reflects a valued concept for the U.S. military.

There are also some minor but important steps taken to promote capacity and interoperability in Europe. First, a battalion sized task force is committed to conduct training missions in Europe. While this is a small unit, it is actually a fairly strong commitment that has not been done in the past. Another important point is that the Joint Multinational Training Command, an element that provides training to U.S. and partner units in Europe will not be affected by the drawdown. It is training centers like this and educational and research institutes like the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies, and NATO School in which a great deal of interoperability is developed, all of which will stay in Europe.

But there are also troubling signs on the horizon. Interoperability will likely decrease as we drawdown forces in Afghanistan if for no other reason than funding and other resources dedicated to the training partners on the part of both the U.S. and our Allies.⁵⁰ Of even greater impact, however, will be the lack of real world coalition operations which create the ultimate crucible for building interoperability.

The age of austerity with its fiscal constraints will undoubtedly impact security assistance funding of which a large portion goes to the purchase of equipment or training to support interoperability. If the 2013 budget request from the Obama Administration is

any guide, then future years may also decrease. The initial budget requests for IMET, FMF, and OCO funding were unsurprisingly all lower (except for an increase in FMF total funding, but only two countries realized increases, Israel and Pakistan, while the rest of world saw their funding stay steady or more often decrease).⁵¹ Further, the potential loss of 1206 funding if not reapproved by Congress will have a major impact on training our allies. From 2006-2011, Congress has appropriated approximately 1.5 billion dollars solely focused on training and preparing partners to conduct operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.⁵²

But at the end of the day what is important is whether our European Allies perceive a commitment on the part of the United States. The answer to this should be yes because of the following three reasons. Notwithstanding the language of Article V, U.S. forces in Europe do matter, but we will be keeping a large and sizeable force in Europe. This force along with the commitments to the NRF will provide a larger commitment to Europe than before. It will just not all be stationed in Europe. Second, we are leaving the right types of forces in Europe to allow for a rapid return of forces. Finally, we are providing new capabilities to NATO that in fact responds better to the most likely threats facing Europe than two combat brigades would, namely, augmentation to our Special Forces and BMD. What is the shortcoming to the current drawdown as planned is its ability to support NATO interoperability and capacity building. The next section of this paper will provide some thoughts on how the United States and its NATO Allies could strengthen this deficit.

Section Four – Toward New Partnerships?

U.S. infrastructure in Europe and elsewhere that supports interoperability, e.g., JMTC, the NATO School, the Marshall Center, Task Force East is an important multiplier for building partner capacity and interoperability in Europe. However, the U.S. should also seek additional funding support from other NATO Allies to support and in some cases widen these programs. This is especially important for JMTC. Each of these centers provide significant benefit to training and bring leaders and soldiers from all of the NATO Allies together either in training events, courses or conferences.

In addition, a number of countries are building JMTC like facilities to support their training, often with the support of USAREUR through JMTC. EUCOM should pick the top tier of those efforts and work with countries in the region to create pooled regional training centers instead of working with all of the countries desiring this capability. The U.S. should focus support from JMTC and additional security assistance funding from the countries in the region to support these programs if the country hosting the facility is willing to commit to a regional center and provide a strong commitment of its own national resources. This would be a great effort to assist in Smart Defense and pooling of defense resources.

EUCOM should look for any and all avenues that would allow cross training of Allied partners' brigadier generals, field grade officers, and mid to senior NCOs. There are three important reasons for this. First, personnel in these ranks will play an important role on future theater and operational coalition staffs. Interacting in significant ways with brigadier generals, (a level of proven potential), and field grade officers will

not only provide better leadership in NATO but will also provide a stronger pool of future coalition senior commanders and staff at the two and three star level.

However, most NATO partner countries have no internal ability to develop these officers at this level. Many countries' highest level of field command is at the division level and often these divisions have not deployed on real world missions. This means that the only other places to gain this operational experience at the moment are on NATO staffs or in Afghanistan. However, the ISAF mission will end shortly and NATO billets are limited. Allowing Allied officers to serve on U.S. staff at the division, corps, Army and COCOM level would provide important experience for these officers. It will also provide an excellent opportunity for these officers to learn many of the key skills necessary to help improve their forces interoperability with U.S. forces. Second, this supports efforts of NATO's 'Smart Defense' by pooling some capabilities. Third, it will help to build additional individual relationships between the U.S. and Allied Armed Forces. With the end of ISAF, opportunities like this will be limited.

If the U.S. does not develop a mechanism to maintain this important integration from its operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, it will instead be relying on it to occur when it goes to war. While we have proven that this is possible to do in Iraq and Afghanistan, already having a cadre of officers familiar with U.S. operations at division and higher levels will only improve the future effectiveness of coalitions that the U.S. either leads or operates in as a member. While training provides some opportunities to develop these skills, no experience is better than extended assignments working shoulder to shoulder with U.S. forces for long periods of time.

Of course the reverse is also true, and therefore, we should increase the Personnel Exchange Program (PEP) positions to EUCOM and its ASCC staffs and offer some countries the opportunity to provide individual augmentees to key billets on these staffs outside of the PEP system. EUCOM should also offer individual key developmental billets to allied and partner field grade officers in our tactical units stationed in Europe. EUCOM should request that our partners provide units and key staff personnel to augment our regionally aligned brigades to include those assigned outside of EUCOM. These augmentations should start during the training phase and last through the mission phase.

U.S. should not only focus on brigade and battalion exercises and training with our European Allies. With the withdrawal of all U.S. division headquarters and future withdrawal of V Corps, the U.S. must also maintain exercises and exchanges at this crucial tactical and operational level. Once again, much has been gained over the last ten years with British and Polish division deploying on real world combat missions with US forces. But with these missions drawing down and US headquarters leaving or already having left Europe, NATO Allies on both sides of the Atlantic need to ensure that exercise and exchanges focus on maintaining this level of operation also. Perhaps one of the best ways would be through command post exercise of the NRF force with corresponding U.S. division and/or corps headquarters. Another option would be to seek distributive command post exercises with between U.S. headquarters in the United States and European headquarters.

In this modern age of austerity, the United States should not be the country required to send its forces across an ocean to train. Our European Allies should commit to

exercises in the United States. There are three reasons for this. First, if this is a true alliance and partnership based on an Article V commitment, then this commitment extends to the US and Canada. In fact, the only time that NATO has invoked Article V was just for this type of situation – the terrorist attacks in the United States on 9/11. Since North America is virtually half of the alliance in geography and strength, there should be exercises and unit training conducted here. Second, Europe expects the U.S. to provide forces and to use these forces to maintain interoperability; European Allies should provide the same opportunities for United States forces based in the United States. Finally, such a commitment from our European Allies would serve as an important signal to many in Congress that Europe does take NATO serious and is willing to commit its own resources to maintain interoperability. In an age of declining resources, this would be a strong signal and help to reinforce the other half of the alliance concerning Europe's own commitment.

A final direction for new cooperation is in the field of security cooperation.⁵³ The European Allies, who are already capable to provide coalition forces, could certainly export security to third party nations especially where they have close historical or cultural ties, or where their tactics or doctrines would be better suited to providing assistance (e.g., a smaller Allied nations human resources programs or professional military education system may be a better match for many nations than the U.S. military's own system). Through a collaborative approach, the U.S. and European Allies could prioritize security cooperation to select third party countries and then coordinate programs that would allow for the Allies to provide assistance individually, with some minor assistance through U.S. provided enablers (e.g., air lift, subject matter experts, or

logistical sustainment), or through combined bilateral or even multilateral security cooperation activities.

While this may seem somewhat novel, the truth of the matter is that we have been doing this to a large extent in Afghanistan and Iraq with our allies by training the indigenous forces with multinational training teams. Such a concept could expand to other countries in the Middle East and Africa, where Europe has its own interests that could help to drive such a collaborative endeavor.

Conclusion

While a geopolitical power shift to Asia and a safer Europe has led to a pivot to Asia and drawdown in Europe, this drawdown will maintain our commitment to NATO through a better allocation of the right forces and capabilities. It also presents an important opportunity to develop new and innovative relationships with our closest allies. Taking advantage of this opportunity will require commitment from both sides. The U.S. needs to follow through on its commitment to deploy forces, and our NATO allies need to ensure they provide enough resources – primarily defense dollars for acquisition and training – for their forces in order for them to be real partners.

Endnotes:

¹ Dougherty, Kevin, “20 years after the Berlin Wall: In Europe, U.S. military remains committed to ensuring stability while taking on new threats,” Stars and Stripes, November 9, 2009, <http://www.stripes.com/news/20-years-after-the-berlin-wall-in-europe-u-s-military-remains-committed-to-ensuring-stability-while-taking-on-new-threats-1.96353> (accessed 1 April 2012).

²For implications of the U.S. debt crisis, see IMF Official Website, “IMF Survey: US Economy Recovering, Debt and Unemployment Next Challenges,” July 8, 2010,

<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/survey/so/2010/new070810b.htm> (accessed April 15, 2012; Zuckerman, Mort, "The National Debt Crisis is an Existential Threat," U.S. News and World Report, April 26, 2011, <http://www.usnews.com/opinion/mzuckerman/articles/2011/04/26/the-national-debt-crisis-is-an-existential-threat> (accessed April 15, 2012); and Council of Foreign Relations Analysis Brief, "Issue Guide: Global Implications of the US Debt Crisis," August 1, 2011, <http://www.cfr.org/financial-crises/issue-guide-global-implications-us-debt-crisis/p25436> (accessed April 15, 2012).

³ Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mullen has been the most vocal senior military officer on the threat that debt poses, stating, "[t]he most significant threat to our national security is our debt. And the reason I say that is because the ability for our country to resource our military -- and I have a pretty good feeling and understanding about what our national security requirements are -- is going to be directly proportional -- over time, not next year or the year after, but over time -- to help our economy." Interview with CNN, CNN Website, "Mullen: Debt is Top National Security Threat," http://articles.cnn.com/2010-08-27/us/debt.security.mullen_1_pentagon-budget-national-debt-michael-mullen?_s=PM:US (accessed April 15, 2012).

⁴ Masters, Jonathan, "US Deficit and the National Debt," Council of Foreign Relations Official Website, March 2, 2012, <http://www.cfr.org/united-states/us-deficits-national-debt/p27400> (accessed April 15, 2012).

⁵ For comments from ADM Mullen, please see, DoD Website, "National Debt Poses Security Threat, Mullen Says," August 27, 2012, <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=60621> (accessed April 15, 2012). For comments from GEN Dempsey, please see, USA Today Website, "Panetta, Joint Chiefs Chairman Dempsey Defend Military Budget Cuts," February 14, 2012, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/story/2012-02-14/panetta-defense-budget/53089728/1> (accessed April 15, 2012).

⁶ DOD Official Website, "Statement on Strategic Defense Guidance," January 5, 2012, <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1643> (accessed April 15, 2012).

⁷ Garamone, Jim, "Panetta Announces Fiscal 2013 Budget Priorities," January 26, 2012, <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=66940> (accessed February 12, 2012).

⁸ For arguments against the drawdown, please see: Manske, Chad, "Opinion: US military presence in Europe matters," Global Post, January 31, 2012, <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/regions/europe/120130/opinion-US-military-presence-defense-strategy> (accessed February 21, 2012); The Economist, "Rebalancing America's forces: The Downgrade of Europe," January 14, 2012, <http://www.economist.com/node/21542789> (accessed January 15, 2012) and Budihas, Chris, "The Strategic Importance of U.S. forces in Europe," Army Magazine, February 2012, 21-22.

⁹ U.S. Department of Defense Webpage, "Defense Budget Priorities and Choices," January 2012, http://www.defense.gov/news/Defense_Strategic_Guidance.pdf (accessed February 22, 2012), 5-6.

¹⁰ U.S. Department of Defense Webpage, "Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense," http://www.defense.gov/news/Defense_Strategic_Guidance.pdf (accessed February 22, 2012), 2.

¹¹ US European Command Website, "USEUCOM Releases Command Statement on Force Posture," U.S. European Command, Public Affairs, February 16, 2012, <http://www.eucom.mil/article/23125/useucom-releases-command-statement-on-force-posture> (accessed April 1, 2012).

¹² This drawdown, occurring in the early 1990s, resulted in the removal of 100,000 personnel, one corps headquarters, and two divisions.

¹³ U.S. Department of Defense Webpage, "Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense," http://www.defense.gov/news/Defense_Strategic_Guidance.pdf (accessed February 22, 2012), 3.

¹⁴ This is the opening sentence from the DoD congressionally mandated annual report on China. The Department of Defense official website, "Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China, 2011: A Report to Congress," http://www.defense.gov/pubs/pdfs/2011_cmpr_final.pdf (accessed April 5, 2012) i.

¹⁵ Zkaria, Fareed, *The Post American World*, (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2009) 1, 86-7, 129.

¹⁶ The National Intelligence Council and the European Union Institute for Security Studies, "Global Governance 2025: At a Critical Juncture," September, 2010, 11. The analysis of hard power by International Futures shows a major geopolitical power shift with a rising China and India at the expense of the U.S., EU, Russia, and Japan. While the U.S. remained the largest power at roughly 18% of the world global power in 2025, China was a close second with approximately 16%. See also Hughes, Barry, "Economic Futures and their Implications for Global Development: The Unfolding of the Great Recession," August, 2009, <http://www.ifs.du.edu/assets/documents/NICIFsRecession.pdf> (accessed February 19, 2012), 25.

¹⁷ The World Bank, "Gross domestic product, 2010," July 1, 2011, <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/GDP.pdf> (accessed February 19, 2012) and The World Bank, "GDP Growth (annual %)," <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.KD.ZG> (accessed February 19, 2012).

¹⁸ Brzezinski, Zbigniew, *Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power* (New York: Basic Books, 2012), 79-80.

¹⁹ Carter, Ashton C. and Bulkeley, Jennifer B., "America's Strategic Response to China's Military Modernization," *Harvard Asia Pacific Review*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Winter 2007), http://www.hcs.harvard.edu/~hapr/winter07_gov/carter.pdf (accessed April 5, 2012) 50.

²⁰ In a recent Brookings article, Michael D Swaine and M. Taylor Fravel discuss the recent Chinese actions and growing assertiveness in the South China Sea since 2008. Noting

that all countries in the area have become more assertive and recent Chinese statements like the exclusive economic zone it claims are not new, China in particular has “demonstrated a growing willingness and ability to affirm its claims.” See “China’s Assertive Behavior – Part Two the Maritime Periphery,” China Leadership Monitor, No. 35, Summer 2011, <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/CLM35MS.pdf>, (accessed April 5, 2012) 2-3, 14. Vikram Nehru, senior fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, recently wrote about the tension in the South China Sea noting increased Chinese intrusions into these waters and predicts that the tensions will likely rise in 2012. See “Southeast Asia in 2012: Four Clouds and a Silver Lining,” January 26, 2012, <http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/01/26/southeast-asia-in-2012-four-clouds-and-silver-lining/972m#> (accessed April 5, 2012).

²¹ The Department of Defense official website, “Military and Security Developments Involving the People’s Republic of China, 2011: A Report to Congress,” http://www.defense.gov/pubs/pdfs/2011_cmpr_final.pdf (accessed April 5, 2012) i.

²² U.S. Census Bureau Webpage, “Foreign Trade – US Top Trading Partners, Year to Date – December 2010,” <http://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/statistics/highlights/toppartners.html> (accessed February 22, 2012). China is also ranked as the third country with whom we send our exports. It ranks behind Canada and Mexico.

²³ Kaplan, Robert D., *Monsoon: The Indian Ocean and the Future of American Power*, (New York: Random House, 2010), i.

²⁴ The World Bank, “Gross domestic product, 2010,” July 1, 2011, <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/GDP.pdf> (accessed February 19, 2012).

²⁵ The International Institute for Strategic Studies Website, “Military Balance 2012 – Press Statement,” <http://www.iiss.org/publications/military-balance/the-military-balance-2012/press-statement/> (accessed April 5, 2012).

²⁶ The reality is that this is not a new effort by the Obama Administration. One can trace this change in priorities back to the Clinton Administration in reaction to the end of the Cold War and the rising economic strength in Asia. The Bush Administration continued this change of focus, which could be seen by Secretary Rumsfeld efforts to further decrease forces in Europe and to develop a “lily pad” concept. The Obama Administration has voiced this process in the most public manner.

²⁷ U.S. Department of Defense Webpage, “Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense,” http://www.defense.gov/news/Defense_Strategic_Guidance.pdf (accessed February 22, 2012), 2.

²⁸ CIA Website, “A Comparison of Warsaw Pact and NATO Defense Activities, 1976-1986,” December 1987, http://www.foia.cia.gov/docs/DOC_0000969822/DOC_0000969822.pdf (accessed April 5, 2012) 4, 7.

²⁹ They are Albania, Bulgaria, the former East Germany, Czech and Slovak Republics, Hungary, Poland, and Romania.

³⁰ RIA Novosti, "History of NATO Enlargement," [www.
http://en.rian.ru/infographics/20101108/161251239.html](http://en.rian.ru/infographics/20101108/161251239.html) (accessed April 1, 2012).

³¹ NATO Official Website, "Study on NATO Enlargement," September 3, 1995, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_24733.htm (accessed April 5, 2012) and "NATO Enlargement," http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49212.htm (accessed April 5, 2012).

³² NATO, "Financial and Economic Data Relating to NATO Defence," March 10, 2011, http://www.nato.int/nato_static/assets/pdf/pdf_2011_03/20110309_PR_CP_2011_027.pdf (accessed February 20, 2012), 6. For additional countries in Europe, please see World Bank Data Webpage, "Military Expenditures by Countries," <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/MS.MIL.XPND.GD.ZS> (accessed February 23, 2012).

³³ U.S. Department of Defense Webpage, "Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense," http://www.defense.gov/news/Defense_Strategic_Guidance.pdf (accessed February 22, 2012), 3.

³⁴ Because the Ballistic Missile Defense systems to be deployed to Europe between 2012 and 2018 were already part of earlier budget request, this should not be considered to be a new expenditure for military forces in Europe.

³⁵ U.S. Congressional Budget Office, *Options for Changing the Army's Overseas Basing* (Washington, DC: U.S. Congressional Budget Office, May 2004), 19. Note: Utilizing the inflation calculator at <http://www.dollartimes.com/calculators/inflation.htm>, the original 2004 dollar amount was 178 million dollars. This number has been adjusted to the increase in inflation over the time period from 2004 to 2012.

³⁶ Ibid, 34. Note: Utilizing the inflation calculator at <http://www.dollartimes.com/calculators/inflation.htm>, the original 2004 dollar amount was 26 million dollars. This number has been adjusted to the increase in inflation over the time period from 2004 to 2012.

³⁷ While there will also be increased cost to support forward deployed Aegis destroyers and other BMD infrastructure, these increases in personnel and equipment were already factored into the budget process. Therefore, there are no additional budget costs for maintaining these programs nor are there savings.

³⁸ U.S. Congressional Budget Office, *Options for Changing the Army's Overseas Basing* (Washington, DC: U.S. Congressional Budget Office, May 2004), 58.

³⁹ CBO Website, *Budget Options Volume 2*, August 2009, <http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/ftpdocs/102xx/doc10294/08-06-budgetoptions.pdf> (accessed April 9, 2012) 7.

⁴⁰ The official text of Article V: "The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognised by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert

with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.” Taken from the NATO Treaty, signed in Washington, DC on 4 April 1949 and found at the official NATO website, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm (accessed April 4, 2012).

⁴¹ Ducasse, Mark and Santamato, Stefano, “The Evolving Relevance of NATO Article V, Ten Years after 9/11,” <http://inssblog.wordpress.com/2011/09/08/the-evolving-relevance-of-natos-article-5-ten-years-after-911/> (accessed April 4, 2012).

⁴² Another way to view this would be to look at the total brigades needed to meet the commitments we have outlined. It will require 2 BCTs to be stationed in Europe and the commitment of three U.S. BCTs to meet the full time commitment of one ready brigade for the NRF. This is because in addition to the one brigade in mission status, an additional brigade will be in the training phase to take on the mission and a third brigade will be in a recovery state. Under the current ARFORGEN model, each phase is to last a year.

⁴³ The author reviewed the following EU, NATO, UK, and US security documents to develop a list of commonly accepted threats to Europe:

EU Website, *A SECURE EUROPE IN A BETTER WORLD - THE EUROPEAN SECURITY STRATEGY*, <http://consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf> (accessed April 3, 2012);

EU Website, *REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EUROPEAN SECURITY STRATEGY - PROVIDING SECURITY IN A CHANGING WORLD*, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/reports/104630.pdf (accessed April 3, 2012);

EU Website, *INTERNAL SECURITY STRATEGY FOR THE EUROPEAN UNION 'TOWARDS A EUROPEAN SECURITY MODEL'*, 23 FEBRUARY 2010; <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/10/st05/st05842-re02.en10.pdf> (accessed April 3, 2012);

UK Official Government Website, “A Strong Britain in an Age of Uncertainty: National Security Strategy,” http://www.direct.gov.uk/prod_consum_dg/groups/dg_digitalassets/@dg/@en/documents/digitalasset/dg_191639.pdf?CID=PDF&PLA=furl&CRE=nationalsecuritystrategy (accessed April 3, 2012); and

The Whitehouse Official Website, “National Security Strategy,” May 2010, http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf (accessed April 15, 2012).

⁴⁴ Serfaty, Simon and Biscop, Sven, “A Shared Security Strategy for Euro-Atlantic Partnership of Equals,” CSIS, July 2009, http://csis.org/files/publication/090715_Serfaty_SharedSecurity_Web.pdf (accessed April 3, 2012) 7-8, 10.

⁴⁵ NATO Official Website, “NATO – Topic: Strategic Concept,” http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_56626.htm, (accessed April 22, 2012).

⁴⁶ U.S. Department of Defense Webpage, "Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense," http://www.defense.gov/news/Defense_Strategic_Guidance.pdf (accessed February 22, 2012), 7.

⁴⁷ This brigade's mission is: The 162d Infantry Brigade trains Advisor Skills, Combat Skills, and Security Force Assistance Skills to provide Army and Joint Force Commanders with trained personnel and units to build partner nation security capacity. Please see the 162nd Infantry Training Brigade Official Website, http://www.jrtc-polk.army.mil/Transition_team/Bde_mission.html (accessed April 21, 2012).

⁴⁸ Munoz, Carlo, "The Army Builds First of New Brigades to Train Foreign Militaries," AOL Defense, October 17, 2011, <http://defense.aol.com/2011/10/17/army-builds-first-of-new-brigades-to-train-foreign-militaries/> (accessed April 21, 2012).

⁴⁹ Hoffman, Frank, "Pentagon's New Guidance," Defense News Website, January 29, 2012, <http://www.defensenews.com/article/20120129/DEFBEAT05/301290003/Pentagon-8217-s-New-Guidance> (accessed April 21, 2012).

⁵⁰ The close interoperation and training to prepare NATO Allies' forces have had a major impact on interoperability of our forces in a real world contingency operation. The United States has committed billions of dollars to support Allies in preparing and in execution of these missions. One of the impacts of the end of operations will be the interoperability developed over the course of the last decade. While joint training and exercises can maintain some element of this, it can never fully replace six month deployments in a 24/7 operational environment which demands that forces become interoperable or suffer increased casualties and losses.

⁵¹ The State Department Website, "Executive Budget Summary: Function 150 & Other International Programs," February 13, 2012, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/183755.pdf> (accessed April 9, 2012) 166-173.

⁵² Serafino, Nina M., "Security Assistance Reform 'Section 1206' Background and Issues for Congress," Congressional Research Service, January 13, 2012, <http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/natsec/RS22855.pdf> (accessed April 9, 2012) 1, 5.

⁵³ I would like to thank my Army War College Academic Advisor, Dr. Alan Stolberg, for assisting with the development of this concept.